

**MINUTES**  
**CALIFORNIA TRAFFIC CONTROL DEVICES COMMITTEE (CTCDC)**  
**MEETING**  
**NOVEMBER 9, 2000**

The third and last meeting of the CTCDC in 2000 was held in the City Council Chamber of Palm Desert in the City of Palm Desert, on November 9, 2000.

Chairman Ray Mellen opened the meeting at 9:30 a.m. with the introduction of members and guests. The Chairman thanked Dick Folkers for the use of their building for the meeting. The following members, alternates and guests were in attendance:

<b>ATTENDANCE</b>	<b>ORGANIZATION</b>	<b>TELEPHONE</b>
Members (Voting)		
Ray Mellen Chairman	Auto Club Southern California, Costa Mesa	(714) 885-2301
Jim Larsen Vice Chairman	CA State Association of Counties County of Tulare	(559) 733-6291
Gerry Meis	Caltrans	(916) 654-4551
Karen Douglas	CHP, Sacramento	(916) 657-7222
Wayne Tanda	League of CA Cities, City of San Jose	(408) 277-4945
Dwight Ku	California State Automobile Association	(415) 241-8904
John Presleigh	CA State Association of Counties County of Santa Cruz	(831) 454-2391
John Fisher	League of CA Cities, City of Los Angeles	(213) 580-1189

<b>ALTERNATE</b>	<b>ORGANIZATION</b>	<b>TELEPHONE</b>
------------------	---------------------	------------------

Richard Backus	ACSC	(714) 885-2326
----------------	------	----------------

John Squier	Assistant Deputy Director LA County	(213) 458-5900
-------------	--	----------------

Mark Greenwood	City of Palm Desert	(760) 776-6450
----------------	---------------------	----------------

<b>ATTENDEES</b>	<b>ORGANIZATION</b>	<b>TELEPHONE</b>
------------------	---------------------	------------------

Sandy Champion	CHP	(916) 657-7222
----------------	-----	----------------

Matt Schmitz	FHWA	(916) 498-5850
--------------	------	----------------

Peter Floodman	Light Guard System, INC	(707) 542-4547
----------------	-------------------------	----------------

Garry Tsutsumi	City of Stockton	(209) 937-8611
----------------	------------------	----------------

John Hoxie	Caltrans Legal	(916) 654-2630
------------	----------------	----------------

Roland W. Tong	Caltrans D7	(213) 897-1351
----------------	-------------	----------------

Yunus Ghausi	Caltrans D7	(213) 897-0560
--------------	-------------	----------------

Norman Hawkins	Hawkins Traffic Safety	(510) 525-4040
----------------	------------------------	----------------

Mike Yung	Caltrans D7	(213) 897-0263
-----------	-------------	----------------

Jerry Tripp	Caltrans D6	(559) 488-4174
-------------	-------------	----------------

Jim Lapham	Barricade & Flasher Rental, Inc.	(909) 599 7998
------------	----------------------------------	----------------

## **MEMBERSHIP**

Chairman Ray Mellen and committee members gave recognition to Mr. Dick Folkers for his long service on the committee. Ray Mellen presented a plaque to Mr. Dick Folkers behalf of the CTCDC. Mr. John Fisher has replaced Dick Folkers as the Southern California League of California Cities (SCLCC) representative. Mr. Mark Greenwood is the new alternate member representing SCLCC.

## **MNUTES**

Amendment to the August 17, 2000 minutes:

Page 9 of 13, Item 00-5, "I would like to ask the City" replace with "Wayne Tanda ask the City".

Page 11 of 13, Discussion Item, "The City of Los Angeles" replace with "the County of Los Angeles".

**MOTION:** By Wayne Tanda, second by Jim Larsen, to adopt the minutes as amended, of the CTCDC meeting held on August 17, 2000 in Sacramento. Motion carried 8-0.

## **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

None.

#### **00-4 USE OF RAISED PAVEMENT MARKERS FOR TRANSVERSE PLACEMENT**

Ray Mellen said that in the past a sub committee was formed involving Jim Larsen, Dick Folkers with the assistance from FHWA and Caltrans to review this item. Ray asked Jim Larsen to apprise the committee. Jim said that the MUTCD 2000 is silent about the specific use of RPMs in a transverse pattern, but it says, RPMs may be used to supplement other markings or marking materials. Jim briefed the committee about the questionnaire he had sent out to local agencies. He received responses from 10 Cities and 6 Counties, where the majority of responses indicated that they have used RPMs only as rumble strips. Jim also posted a questionnaire on the ITE web page and received 20 responses. Eight of 20 said they never used RPMs in a transverse application. Seven of 20 said they have used RPMs as rumble strips, one said in the gore area, one in advance of a stop sign and one in advance of a crosswalk. Matt Schmitz from FHWA told the committee that he also contacted other states and the information he received is similar to Mr. Jim Larsen's. John Presleigh told the committee that RPMs are used in their jurisdiction in advance of tight curves and in advance of 25-mph speed limit signs.

Gerry Meis asked the committee, if there has ever been a case in the past where the committee recommended Caltrans add a traffic control device in the Traffic Manual without going through the experimental process? The committee members did not recall but believed it could be done. Wayne Tanda pointed out to the committee that the Caltrans Traffic Manual does address the use of rumble strips with bands of raised material. Wayne further suggested that the committee should wait for the final rule making of the MUTCD 2000, which is due in December of 2000, and to continue the item at that time. Ray Mellen asked for comments from the committee members and audiences. There were none.

**MOTION:** Moved by Wayne Tanda, second by Gerry Meis, continue the item until the final rule making published by the FHWA. Motion Carried 8-0.

**ACTION:** Item to be continued.

Ray Mellen asked for discussion on the motion. John Fisher said that after reviewing the survey and hearing comments from the committee members, it is appropriate to continue the item until the final rule making is published by the FHWA.

## **00-7 MODIFICATION TO WINDING ROAD (W14) SIGN**

Jim Larsen introduced Mr. John Squire from LA County and asked him to address the committee on the proposed modified policy of the winding road sign. Gerry Meis said he wants to give the background history about this sign before John Squire addresses the committee. Gerry informed the committee that in the past this committee had discussed winding road signs plus a report on Curve Warning Signs prepared by Caltrans, and the committee was in agreement with the current policy.

John Squire briefed the committee that the reason behind revising the policy of the winding road sign was to clarify to the individuals and public agencies involved in the placement of winding road signs. John informed the committee that individuals have sued LA County in the past, as a result of accidents on a widening road segment. Their claim was that there is not enough curve warning signs with an advisory speed plate advance of the curves. The proposed modified policy on winding road signs is a joint effort of the LA County Public Works Department and their Legal Counsel. The modified policy would be clear to the Engineers, Juries and to Courts that the intent of the policy is not to sign each curve on a winding road segment. Moreover, the modified policy does not change the current signage practice.

Gerry Meis told the committee that Caltrans Legal Office does have some concerns on the modified wording, and suggested to the committee that LA County's Legal Counsel and Caltrans Legal Office should get together to review the modified policy and come up with a wording, which is agreeable to both Offices. Gerry further suggested that the agenda item should be continued at the next meeting. John Fisher said in his opinion, the modified policy is clearer and he supports the changes. Jim Larsen expressed his view and said he also agreed with the changes. It was in the Committee's opinion that the modified policy is clearer, but at the same time, they agreed to continue this item at the next meeting, so that Caltrans Legal Office and LA County's Legal Counsel would have time to jointly review and provide any comments or concerns. Wayne Tanda pointed out to the committee that Caltrans Policy and MUTCD policy are not consistent in signing practice, therefore it should be appropriate to discuss at this time. Gerry suggested to the committee that Wayne's concern should be addressed separately. Ray Mellen agreed with Gerry's suggestion and asked for comments from committee members and from the audience. There were none. Ray asked for a motion.

**00-7 MODIFICATION TO WINDING ROAD (W14) SIGN** (continued)

**MOTION:** Moved by Gerry Meis, second by Dwight Ku, Caltrans Legal Office and County of LA legal Counsel discuss the language in the signing policy and work with Gerry's office and come back to the committee with the proposed language. Motion carried 8-0.

Ray asked for comments on the motion from committee members and from the audience. There were none.

**ACTION:** Item to be continued.

Wayne Tanda asked Ray Mellen if this is an appropriate time to bring up a related item to this item. Ray responded yes.

Wayne pointed out to the committee that Caltrans winding road signing policy and MUTCD signing policy are not consistent and should be addressed since there is a proposal to modify the current policy. Wayne further suggested that he wants this item to be brought back to the committee at least as a discussion item during the next meeting. Gerry Meis informed the committee that the winding road sign has been discussed a number of times by this committee in the past and it was determined that the Caltrans signage policy should be continued in California verses the National policy. Gerry further said as a motorist, he prefers California signage practice because the standard signing of the first curve attracts the motorist's attention, warns him to slow down and then the winding road sign gives the next information about the geometry of the roadway. Jim Larsen said he would also prefer the California signage practice because the first sign advises the motorist of the appropriate speed/direction of the roadway and the second sign indicates to the motorist how long this condition exists. Jim Larsen further suggested that the appropriate time to discuss this inconsistency would be when Caltrans adopts the MUTCD with the California Supplement to the MUTCD. John Fisher pointed out to the committee that the National policy has a "May" condition when California has a "Should" condition. Wayne agreed with the other committee member's comments and withdrew his suggestion. Ray Mellen asked for any other comments on the extension of this item from the members and from the audience. There were none.

## **00-8 PEDESTRIAN COUNTDOWN SIGNAL HEADS**

Ray Mellen asked Wayne Tanda to address this item since he is the sponsor and his agency is the applicant for experimentation. Wayne Tanda told the Committee that the City of San Jose is requesting authorization for the experimentation on Pedestrian Countdown Signal Heads (PCSH) at five locations in the City of San Jose. The City would come back with a final report in the spring of 2002. Wayne pointed out to the committee that there are two locations on the State Route 82 and the City will work with Caltrans District 4 in regard to those two locations. Ray Mellen asked Gerry Meis if Caltrans had any concerns about the two locations, which are on State Route 82. Gerry responded that as long as the City and Caltrans District 4 are in agreement, he does not have any concern.

John Fisher expressed that uniformity is very important for this new traffic control device and he wanted to know if there is uniformity regarding the start of the countdown. In other words, does the countdown begin at the start of the Walk or Flashing Don't Walk? Wayne Tanda referred this question to Garry Tustusmi of the City of Stockton who was in attendance to obtain authorization for similar devices in the City of Stockton. Mr. Tustusmi responded that the countdown starts with the Flashing Don't Walk. John Fisher further stated that the study should include information regarding its effectiveness, such as the number and percentage of pedestrians illegally entering the crosswalk on the Flashing Don't Walk or Solid Don't walk, during the before and after periods. Finally, he requested that the study include a survey regarding the public's comprehension of the simultaneous display of the Flashing Don't Walk and the countdown. Specifically, it would be desirable to know what percentage of the public incorrectly interprets the simultaneous display to mean that leaving the curb is legal as long as the pedestrian can complete the crossing before the countdown reaches zero.

Wayne Tanda responded that the City of San Jose would address all the concerns, in their study, that have been raised by John Fisher as well as motorist behavior "before and after." This behavior could be characterized by the number of cars running yellow and red signals and might indicate whether motorist speed up because of this device. In addition to that study, the survey would also include pedestrian behaviors that could be affected by installing these devices, hesitating in the roadway, running as well as returning to the curb after starting to cross.

**00-8 PEDESTRIAN COUNTDOWN SIGNAL HEADS (continued)**

Ray Mellen asked for comments from the committee members and from the audience. There were none. Ray Mellen asked for the motion.

**MOTION:** Moved by Gerry Meis, second by John Fisher, authorizing the City of San Jose to do the experiment on the pedestrian countdown signal heads. Motion Carried 8-0.

**ACTION:** Item completed.

## **00-9 PEDESTRIAN COUNTDOWN SIGNAL HEADS**

Wayne Tanda introduced Mr. Garry Tustusmi, City of Stockton, and requested him to present his request to the committee. Garry Tustusmi told the committee that the City of Stockton wants approval from this body to experiment with pedestrian countdown signal heads at five locations similar to the City of San Jose's request. The construction is anticipated from December of 2000 to December of 2001. The experiment study would be conducted for one year from December of 2001 to December of 2002, then the final results of the experiment would be submitted to the committee in April of 2002.

Ray Mellen said the committee had discussed pedestrian countdown signal heads under the previous item 00-8. Ray further said the study should include all the comments and concerns discussed under the City of San Jose's request. Garry Tustusmi responded that the City of Stockton would include all those concern in their study. Jim Larsen said he supported the experiment and the City of Stockton should consider the comments made to the City of San Jose. Ray Mellen asked for comments from the committee members and from the audience. There were none.

**MOTION:** Moved by Jim Larsen, second by John Fisher, approving the experimentation for pedestrian countdown signal heads requested by the City of Stockton. Motion carried 8-0.

**ACTION:** Item Completed.

## **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

Matt Schmitz of FHWA told the committee that during the last meeting, this committee had approved the experimentation on Jake Brake signs for the City of Auburn. He said the Jake Brake is a specific product name and may not be appropriate to use on a sign. Matt further said he conducted a nationwide survey on the term Jake Brake and got a mixed response. Some agencies use the term Jake Brake and some use Engine Brake or Compression Brake. Matt revealed that Kansas City has a City Ordinance and they use the term Jake Brake. Matt informed the committee that he had discussion with the American Trucking Association (ATA), and ATA said it is inappropriate to use the term Jake Brake on a sign. The ATA said that most truck drivers understand the terms Engine Brake or Compression Brake. Matt told the committee, that in his opinion, the committee should recommend a generic term for the Jake Brake sign. Gerry Meis responded that the sign is under experimentation and if the experiment indicated it does have a positive impact on truckers, then we would work with FHWA and with the committee to come up with a generic name.

Peter Floodman from LightGuard Systems informed the committee that some local agencies are under the impression that they need CTCDC approval to install in-roadway warning lights (IRWL) at crosswalks (formally known as crosswalk pavement lights). Peter further said it is almost eight years since the device were originally installed and standards and specs have not been developed yet.

Gerry Meis responded that local agencies could get approval from his office and they do not have to go to CTCDC for approval. It is a simple process, the local agency should write him a letter asking approval, and his office will respond within a week. The location would get approval as long as the location meet interim guidelines for IRWL. Gerry further said since this is a new technology and there were no guidelines from FHWA, this committee and Caltrans must evaluate the effectiveness of the device before adding it to the Traffic Manual. Wayne Tanda added that some new traffic control devices could be evaluated in short period while others could take longer time. The IRWL at crosswalk is one of those devices, which require longer time to evaluate, and there is nothing wrong with going through the lengthy process.

## **INFORMATION ITEMS**

### **99-11 MUTCD ADOPTION BY CALTRANS**

Ray Mellen asked Gerry Meis to update the committee on the MUTCD adoption by the State of California. Gerry Meis noted that due to circumstances beyond his control, Caltrans was not ready at this time. Gerry told the committee that during the next meeting, Caltrans would outline the process of developing and adopting a California Supplement to the MUTCD.

Ray Mellen asked Gerry Meis if it is final that Caltrans has made the internal decision to adopt the MUTCD and to develop a California MUTCD Supplement. Gerry said that this is correct and Caltrans will follow the appropriate legal process.

## **00-E LOW VERTICAL CLEARANCE SIGN**

Gerry Meis told the committee that low vertical clearance signs are used to warn motorists of low structure clearances. Gerry further informed the committee that Caltrans has initiated a program to install vertical clearance signs for structures with clearances of 15 feet 6 inches or less, while the previous policy was to install low vertical clearance signs up to less than 15 feet. The signs would be installed above the traveled way, exclusive shoulder, on the approach of all underpasses, overheads, viaducts, overcrossings, undercrossings and grade separations for state highways.

Wayne Tanda asked Gerry Meis if the revised sign policy should also be followed by the local agencies. Gerry Meis responded that they do not have to, as long as they follow the existing policy, because existing policy is consistent with the MUTCD requirement. Caltrans is raising the standards on the state highways for safety reasons. Also, the existing signs are not of the same color, some of them are "black on white" and some are "black on yellow" when all signs should be "black on yellow." John Fisher asked if the existing policy will stay in the Traffic Manual and if the revised policy is intended to be an optional, internal Caltrans policy that would require no Traffic Manual change, or if it was intended that a policy change be initiated and published in the Traffic Manual. Gerry Meis said we have not yet finalized how we are going to address this issue, but the revised policy has already been posted on the Caltrans website and could be reviewed at the following address:

<http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/traffops/signtech/signdel/>

The revised policy clearly states that it applies to State Highways.

Ray Mellen said that consistency is very important for all public agencies and that the minutes of this conversation should clearly reflect what other jurisdictions need in order to follow the low clearance signage practice.

Gerry Meis responded that even though Caltrans plans to sign vertical clearances on all structures that are 15 feet and 6 inches or below, local agencies could still follow the existing policy. The existing policy for low vertical clearance (W34, W34A and W34B) signs is noted in the Traffic Manual on page 4-25 and this policy is consistent with the MUTCD requirements of the low Clearance (W12-2) sign.

**TABLED ITEM**

**94-10 PEDESTRAIN COUNTDOWN SIGNAL HEADS**

The County of Sacramento informed the committee, during the November 1999 meeting, that the County did not have the resources to pursue further studies on the pedestrian countdown signal heads (PCSH). Ray Mellen informed the committee that the PCSH system is still under operation and the County had discontinued their study. Ray asked the committee what the role is of this body when experimentation devices are still in place and study has been terminated. After a long discussion, the committee members agreed that the chair should write a letter to the County of Sacramento requesting the status of the experimentation. The Secretary of the committee would draft a letter and have it reviewed by committee members before the chairman sign it.

## **99-16 CRENSHAW SAFETY BARRIER**

Ray Mellen told the committee that Dick Folkers brought this item to the committee. Ray said he promised, during the November 1999 meeting, that he would review the location and update the committee. Ray handed a packet of material to the committee members, which indicated that the device is in place. Ray further informed the committee that the device was installed because of a Federal mandate regarding safety. Ray introduced Dick Backus, an alternate member of the committee, and asked him to address the committee on this item. Dick Backus told the committee that he had spoken with the City Traffic Engineer, and the City would be willing to do a study and submit a final report to the committee, if the committee is interested in this.

Ray Mellen asked for comments from the committee members and from the audience. John Fisher said the City of LA has a similar situation, where they close a road due to flooding. Ray Mellen said this was an update item, and committee action was not needed.

### **UPDATE ON UNAPPROVED DEVICES**

Ray Mellen said that a crosswalk device used by the City of Loma Linda was brought to the committee's attention during the August of 2000 meeting. At that meeting, committee members recommended that the chair contact the City and inform them of the experimentation process for new traffic control devices. Ray Mellen again introduced Mr. Dick Backus and asked him to update the committee on this item. Dick Backus informed the committee that he had discussed with the Director of PWD/City manager in October 2000 regarding this device called bollards. Dick was advised that the bollards have been moved to a private location (on school property). The City said that if they decided to use this device on a public road, they would seek authorization for experimentation from the CTCDC.

Ray Mellen further informed the committee that Dick Backus does have several other locations where traffic control devices have been installed without getting approval from this committee. Dick Backus provided handouts to committee members containing a number of devices (signs, pedestrian countdown signal heads, and in-roadway warning lights) installed on public roads without the proper approval of this committee. Dick Backus further informed the committee that motorists were cited for violating the "Black On Yellow" advisory speed sign. Karen Douglas stated that she had worked in Southern California for a number of years and had never received a complaint related to this. Further, Karen said CHP does not cite motorists for violating warning signs. Karen added that if motorists have been receiving citations on advisory speed signs, this has not been brought to the attention of CHP management.

Jim Larsen said it is easier to respond during depositions or in a court case if the device is standard or approved by this committee for experimentation. Wayne Tanda stated that some agencies do not have resources to do experimentation or they are not aware of the process. Wayne asked Gerry Meis if it is possible for Caltrans to help public agencies obtaining data for the experimental devices. Gerry responded that he would get back to the committee on this after consulting with the Caltrans New Technology Branch.

In summary, Committee members discussed this non-approved traffic control devices issue in detail and consensus was that there might be agencies or vendors who are not aware of the

**UPDATE ON UNAPPROVED DEVICES** (continued)

process and there might be a need to educate them. The CVC Section 21401 allows only those traffic control devices that conform to the uniform standards and specification promulgated by the Department of Transportation to be placed upon a street or highway. Ray Mellen said he would work with Matt Schmitz of FHWA and inform the committee, on if and how this committee may be involved in this education program.

## **DISCUSSION ITEMS**

### **PROPOSAL TO EXPAND THE COMMITTEE**

Gerry Meis asked Norman Hawkins to address the committee on his proposal to expand the committee. Norm Hawkins introduced himself to the committee as the President of Hawkins Traffic Safety Supply. Norm told the committee that his subject is very simple and it is to expand the committee to include the private sector. Norm Hawkins has written a letter dated September 29, 2000 to the committee explaining the reasons for the expansion of the committee. In summarizing, Norm told the committee that the CTCDC should include a representative from industry, because they have experience in developing, producing and installing traffic control devices. They also perform research for improvements to increase the longevity and/or reduce cost of traffic control devices. Norm further said the private sector is in the business of traffic control devices and their knowledge could be shared so the traffic control device will do what it was intended to do. Norm introduced Mr. Jim Lapham Vice President of Barricade & Flasher Rental, Inc. to the committee.

Mr. Jim Lapham said his concerns are the same as Norm's. This committee is only represented by Cities, Counties, the State and Auto Clubs, which are a group of civil engineers. The committee should be expanded to include representatives from the public and private sectors. Jim further said that in the past, he had attended meetings and was disappointed with the functioning of the committee. Jim asked if the committee had any questions.

John Fisher advised Norm and Jim that the committee would welcome their input during the meetings. John further asked why it may be necessary to be a committee member when they could address the committee as a member of the public. Jim Lapham responded that he had attended committee meetings in the past and was disappointed with the functioning and/or ignoring of the issues he has raised with this committee.

Mark Greenwood, an Alternate Member from SCLCC, said he disagreed and agreed with some comments made by the previous speaker about the committee. Mark expressed his opinion that individuals representing this committee have extensive experience in traffic control devices and

**PROPOSAL TO EXPAND THE COMMITTEE** (continued)

they also represent the interests of their jurisdiction as well as for the state of California. Mark added that he is in favor of adding a person from the private sector.

Ray Mellen asked for comments from the committee members. Wayne Tanda said he is here because the State Legislature requires the Department of Transportation, after consultation with local agencies and public hearings, to adopt rules and regulations prescribing uniform standards and specifications for all official traffic control devices. Each of us represent some agency and brings concerns from our constituents and issues raised by the public, schools, PTA and the agencies we represent. Wayne further asked how we may justify expanding the committee only to vendors or manufactures; but not to other groups. Where do you draw the line?

Jim Larsen reiterated Wayne Tanda's comments regarding the purpose of the CTCDC. Jim further said he is open for discussion and suggested putting this item on the agenda for the next meeting. Ray Mellen agreed to put this item on the agenda for the next meeting.

## **U-TURN SIGNAL HEADS**

Ray Mellen said this is a discussion item and asked Caltrans District 7 to explain the reasoning for the installation to the committee. Mr. Mike Yung from D7 introduced himself to the committee. Mike Yung told the committee that approximately two years ago the Mobile Home Park Association (MHPA) requested Caltrans to install traffic signals at the intersection of Topanga Canyon Blvd (Rte 27) and Indian Drive to facilitate left turns onto NB Rte 27. However, a signal was not warranted due to the low volume of traffic exiting from the driveway and there was no history of accidents related to the driveway. The MHPA requested the installation of a U-turn lane on SB Rte 27 at Santa Susana Pass Rd, which is the first intersection south of the Driveway. The motorists from the Driveway could make a right turn onto SB Rte 27 and then a U-turn from the intersection of Rte 27 and Santa Susana Pass Rd to access NB Rte 27. The reason for installing the U-turn signals was that the intersection is a T-type intersection where a SB left turn movement is not possible. A left turn signal could give a false message to the motorist that they could make a left turn, which leads the motorist to an embankment. Mike concluded his presentation and asked if there were any questions.

John Fisher said it appears that most motorists who make the U-turn are familiar with this intersection, and given that consideration, it might be appropriate to install standard left-turn signal heads with a U-turn sign only. Mike responded that a left turn signal would not be consistent with the movement and it may confuse motorists. Also a left turn signal would cause liability issues if an unfamiliar motorist makes a left turn and ends up in the embankment.

Wayne Tanda suggested putting this item on the agenda for the next meeting for the committee's action. Wayne further said, in his opinion, it may not be a new traffic control device. Gerry Meis agreed with Wayne's comment and said he would like this committee to recommend to Caltrans that in their collective judgement this is not a new traffic control device and Caltrans should develop a standard and specifications for the U-turn signal heads. Ray Mellen said this is a fair suggestion and recommended putting it on the agenda for the next meeting.

## **IMPACTABLE PEDESTRIAN CROSSING DEVICES (MODIFIED PEDESTRIAN CROSSING (W54) SIGN**

Ray Mellen asked Dwight Ku, who was representing Marry Banks, to explain this item. Dwight Ku told the committee that the City of San Francisco would like to know if a pedestrian crossing device (a picture of the device was given to members) requires an experimentation request from the committee. Wayne Tanda said he has concern about the message and also the legibility of the message and recommended including this item on the agenda for the next meeting.

### **ITEMS UNDER EXPERIMENTATION**

A handout was given to the committee members on the items under experimentation. The heading, "Items Under Experimentation" is added on the agenda to keep the committee members, cities, counties and individuals involved in the experimentation process informed about the status of the experimentation.

Dwight Ku gave a follow-up on the status of the City of San Francisco Pedestrian countdown signal heads. 14 locations have been selected two of which are on the state highways. Gerry Meis said that City of San Francisco needs to work with Caltrans District 4 Office about the locations proposed on state highways.

### **STATUS OF CALTRANS ACTIONS**

A draft of the proposed language to the Traffic Manual was given to committee members regarding item 96-3, Illuminated Left Turn Yield Sign. Gerry Meis told the committee that Caltrans would include this in the Traffic Manual unless comments are received from committee members or from others. It would be posted on the Traffic Operation Program website.

### **NEXT MEETING**

Ray Mellen said next meeting will be in Northern California and asked if anyone wants to sponsor the meeting in his or her facility. John Presleigh, County of Santa Cruz offered the Board of Supervisors facility. The committee agreed to hold meeting in Santa Cruz and the meeting would be held on February 15, 2001.

Ray Mellen asked if there were any comments from the committee members or from the audience. There were none.

### **ADJOURNMENT**

**MOTION:** Moved by Jim Larsen, second by Dwight Ku, to adjourn the meeting. Motion carried 8-0. The meeting was adjourned at 2:30p.m.